Document 5

Filed 12/26/2007

Page 1 of 18

Case 3:07-cv-02408-DMS-LSP

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

- 2. Defendant ADMITS that SHC SAN DIEGO, INC. was incorporated in the state of Georgia and has conducted business in California since April, 2005. SHC San Diego, Inc. Was converted to a Delaware limited liability company on June 26, 2007, and is now named SHC San Diego, LLC. Defendants ADMITS that SHC SAN DIEGO, LLC. Is the general partner of Arthroscopic & Laser Surgery Center of San Diego, L.P. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to answer the remaining allegations of paragraph 2.
- 3. The allegations of paragraph 3. do not appear to be directed at this answering Defendant, however, Defendant ADMITS the allegations in paragraph 3 on information and belief.
- 4. The allegations of paragraph 4. do not appear to be directed at this answering Defendant, however, Defendant ADMITS that SURGICAL HEALTH CORPORATION was incorporated in the state of Delaware and DENIES the remaining allegations of paragraph 4. Surgical Health Corporation was converted to a Delaware limited liability company on June 27, 2007, and is now named Surgical Health, LLC.
- 5. Defendant ADMITS that HEALTHSOUTH SURGERY CENTERS-WEST, INC. was incorporated in the state of Delaware and DENIES the remaining allegations of paragraph 5. Delaware HealthSouth Surgery Centers-West, Inc. Converted to a Delaware limited liability company on June 26, 2007 and changed its name to Surgery Centers-West Holdings, LLC.
- 6. Defendant ADMITS that SURGICAL CARE AFFILIATES, LLC (hereinafter "SCA") is a Delaware limited liability company doing business in San Diego County, California. Defendant DENIES the allegations of this paragraph to the extent it refers to "all times herein mentioned," as SCA did not exist until January 23, 2007.
  - 7. Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 7.
  - 8. Defendant DENIES the allegations in paragraph 8.
- 9. Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 9 that it was involved in any wrongdoing. Defendant lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the remaining allegations of paragraph 9.
  - 10. Defendant ADMITS that Plaintiff was a limited partner in Arthroscopic & Laser

24.

25.

26.

Surgery Center	of San Diego, L.P. from 1996 to the present. Defendant DENIES the remaining
allegations of p	paragraph 10.
11.	The allegations of the paragraph 11. do not appear to be directed at this answering
Defendant, how	wever, Defendant ADMITS that SHC SD is the general partner of Arthroscopic &
Laser Surgery	Center of San Diego, L.P. and shared the same principal office with HealthSouth
at One HealthS	South Parkway, Birmingham Alabama, 35243. Defendant ADMITS that SHC San
Diego owns a t	total of 56% of the Partnership and that SHC SD was owned by SHC. Defendant
denies the rema	aining allegations of paragraph 11.
12.	Defendant DENIES the allegations in paragraph 12.
13.	Defendant ADMITS that certain HealthSouth ownership interests were sold to
this Defendant	. Defendant DENIES the remaining allegations of paragraph 13.
14.	Defendant ADMITS that Plaintiff owns an 18% interest in Arthroscopic & Laser
Surgery Center	of San Diego, L.P. Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to answer
the remaining	allegations of paragraph 14.
15.	Defendant ADMITS that the Partnership Agreement speaks for itself.
16.	Defendant lacks sufficient information or belief to answer paragraph 16.
17.	Defendant DENIES the allegations in paragraph 17 to the extent directed at SCA.
18.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 18 to the extent directed at SCA.
19.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 19 to the extent directed at SCA.
20.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 20 to the extent directed at SCA.
21.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 21 to the extent directed at SCA.
22.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 22.
23.	The allegations of paragraph 23. do not appear to be directed at this answering
Defendant, how	wever Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 23 on information and
helief	

The allegations of paragraph 26. do not appear to be directed at this answering

Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 24.

Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 25.

1	Def
2	para
3	
4	Def
5	Bir
6	Ma
7	alle
8	
9	Def
10	con
11	suf
12	
13	Def
14	con
15	suf
16	
17	Def
18	con
19	suf
20	
21	Coı
22	spe
23	alle
24	

26

27

28

fendant, however Defendant lacks sufficient information to answer the allegations of agraph 26.

- 27. The allegations of paragraph 27. do not appear to be directed at this answering fendant, however Defendant ADMITS that HealthSouth and certain of its officers in mingham, Alabama were accused of and investigated for accounting fraud in or around rch 2003. Defendant lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the remaining egations of paragraph 27.
- 28. The allegations of paragraph 28. do not appear to be directed at this answering fendant, however Defendant ADMITS that certain HealthSouth employs admitted to criminal duct and entered guilty pleas as reflected in Exhibit 1 to the Complaint. Defendant lacks ficient information and belief to answer the remaining allegations of paragraph 28.
- 29. The allegations of paragraph 29. do not appear to be directed at this answering fendant, however Defendant ADMITS that certain HealthSouth employs admitted to criminal duct and entered guilty pleas as reflected in Exhibit 1 to the Complaint. Defendant lacks ficient information or belief to answer the remaining allegations of paragraph 29.
- 30. The allegations of the paragraph 30. do not appear to be directed at this answering fendant, however Defendant ADMITS that certain HealthSouth employs admitted to criminal duct and entered guilty pleas as reflected in Exhibit 1 to the Complaint. Defendant lacks ficient information or belief to answer the remaining allegations of paragraph 30.
- 31. Defendant ADMITS that a report was issued by the Special Audit Review mmittee of the Board of Directors of HEALTHSOUTH Corporation and that the Report aks for itself. Defendant lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the remaining egations of paragraph 31.
- 32. The allegations of paragraph 32. do not appear to be directed at this answering Defendant, however Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to answer paragraph 32.
- 33. The allegations of paragraph 33. do not appear to be directed at this answering Defendant, however Defendant DENIES said allegations to the extent they are directed at SCA. Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to answer the remaining allegations of

1	78.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
2		FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
3	В	REACH OF COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING
4	79.	Defendant re-alleges and incorporates by reference its answer to the preceding
5	paragraphs a	s though fully set forth herein.
6	80.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
7	81.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
8	82.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
9	83.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
10	84.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
11	85.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
12		FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
13		BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY
14	86.	Defendant re-alleges and incorporates by reference its answer to the preceding
15	paragraphs a	s though fully set forth herein.
16	87.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
17	88.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
18	89.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
19	90.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
20	91.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
21	92.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
22	93.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
23	94.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
24	95.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
25	96.	This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.
26		SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
27		JUDICIAL DISSOLUTION AND ACCOUNTING
28	97.	Defendant re-alleges and incorporates by reference its answer to the preceding - 7 -

This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.

28

118.

This paragraph is not alleged against this answering Defendant.

28

161.

1		THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION	
2	VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL (sic) §17200-		
3		UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES	
4	162.	Defendant re-alleges and incorporates by reference its answer to the preceding	
5	paragraphs as	though fully set forth herein.	
6	163.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 163.	
7	164.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 164.	
8	165.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 165.	
9	166.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 166.	
10	167.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 167.	
11	168.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 168.	
12	169.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 169.	
13		FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION	
14		SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE	
15	170.	Defendant re-alleges and incorporates by reference its answer to the preceding	
16	paragraphs as	though fully set forth herein.	
17	171.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 171.	
18	172.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 172.	
19	173.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 173.	
20	174.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 174.	
21	175.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 175.	
22	176.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 176 and DENIES that Plaintiff is	
23	entitled to the	relief requested or any relief.	
24	177.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 177 and DENIES that Plaintiff is	
25	entitled to the	relief requested or any relief.	
26	178.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 178 and DENIES that Plaintiff is	
27	entitled to the	relief requested or any relief.	
28	/////		
		<u>- 11 -</u>	

1		FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
2		INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
3	179.	Defendant re-alleges and incorporates by reference its answer to the preceding
4	paragraphs as	though fully set forth herein.
5	180.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 180.
6	181.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 181.
7	182.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 182 and DENIES that Plaintiff i
8	entitled to the	relief requested or any relief.
9	183.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 183.
10		SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
11		INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACT
12	184.	Defendant ADMITS that Plaintiff has no written contract with UCSD pertaining
13	to interests in	"the partnership." Defendant ADMITS that no contract or "Purchase Agreement"
14	as alleged was	signed with Plaintiff. Defendant DENIES the remaining allegations of paragraph
15	184.	
16	185.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 185.
17	186.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 186.
18	187.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 187.
19	188.	Defendant ADMITS that it negotiated with and sold to UCSD an ownership
20	interest in wha	at was known as the UTC Surgery Center. Defendant DENIES the remaining
21	allegations of	paragraph 188.
22	189.	Defendant DENIES the allegations of paragraph 189.
23		SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
24	INTENTION	NAL INTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE
25	190.	Defendant ADMITS that Plaintiff has no written contract with UCSD pertaining
26	to interests in	"the partnership." Defendant ADMITS that no contract or "Purchase Agreement"
27	as alleged was	signed with Plaintiff. Defendant DENIES the remaining allegations of paragraph
28	190.	

should be found legally responsible for any damages alleged by Plaintiff, which Defendant
expressly denies, then such damage was proximately caused or contributed to by the careless,
reckless, negligent, fraudulent or willful conduct of third parties. As a consequence thereof, the
proportionate degree of negligence and fault of such third parties must be determined and
prorated and any judgment that might be rendered against Defendant must be barred or reduced
by the total degree of negligence and fault found to exist as a result of the conduct of such third
parties.

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

# (Comparative Negligence)

Defendant is informed and believes and upon that basis allege that Plaintiff failed to exercise proper or ordinary care, caution or prudence in his own conduct regarding the matters which are alleged in the Complaint. If Defendant should be found legally responsible for any damages alleged by Plaintiff, which Defendant expressly denies, then such damages, if any, were proximately caused or contributed to by Plaintiff's careless, reckless and negligent conduct. As a consequence thereof, the proportionate degree of negligence and fault of Plaintiff must be determined and prorated and any judgment that might be rendered against Defendant must be barred or reduced by the total degree of negligence and fault found to exist as a result of Plaintiff's own conduct.

### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

## (Failure to Mitigate)

Defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Plaintiff failed, refused and neglected to take reasonable steps to mitigate his alleged damages, if any, thus barring or diminishing Plaintiff's recovery herein.

#### FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

#### (Laches)

Defendant is informed and believes and alleges thereon that Plaintiff is barred from any recovery against Defendant by reason of the doctrine of laches and undue delay in giving notice to Defendant of the matters alleged in the Complaint and in commencing this litigation.